



Docket No.: 242098US3CONT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



RE: Application Serial No.: 10/653,997

Applicants: Katsuhiko MIKI

Filing Date: September 4, 2003

For: SHEET FEEDING METHOD AND DEVICE AND
IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS USING THE
DEVICE

Group Art Unit: 3653

Examiner: BOWER, K. W.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF SPECIES

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423

DOCKET NO: 242098US3CONT



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
KATSUHIKO MIKI : EXAMINER: BOWER, K. W.
SERIAL NO: 10/653,997 :
FILED: SEPTEMBER 4, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 3653
FOR: SHEET FEEDING METHOD AND :
DEVICE AND IMAGE FORMING
APPARATUS USING THE DEVICE

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF SPECIES

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Election of Species requirement dated November 2, 2004, the Applicants provisionally elect with traverse the species of Group I corresponding to Figure 1 and identifies Claims 66, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, and 77 as readable on the provisionally elected species.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the election requirement for several reasons.

First, the outstanding Official Action merely includes the conclusory statement that "the application contains claims directed to ... patentably distinct species ..." without stating any basis whatsoever in support of such a finding. This is in violation of MPEP §816, which states:

The particular reasons relied on by the examiner for holding the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given. ...

In the absence of any annunciated basis, it is respectfully submitted that the PTO clearly has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish distinctness.

Secondly, MPEP § 806.04(f) requires:

Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. ..

The outstanding Official Action fails to address in any way whether the pending claims recite mutually exclusive characteristics and this failure provides a further basis for traversing the election requirement.

Finally, MPEP § 803 states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully traverse the outstanding Election requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 55-78 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423